REMARKS

Applicants have carefully considered this Application in connection with the Examiner's Action, and respectfully request reconsideration of this Application in view of the above Amendment and the following remarks.

Pending in the application are Claims 2 – 7.

I. Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §112, Second Paragraph

Claims 2 and 3 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Applicants have amended Claims 2 and 3 above.

Claims 2 and 3 have been amended to correct the inconsistency in the definition of n^o and to specify that n^o is an integer of 2. Applicants note that the number of sp^2C **substitutions** on the P aromatic moiety may be six, eight, or ten, depending on the configuration of the aromatic rings, but that the number of **free** sp^2C sites in each case is only two. Thus, in order to eliminate any confusion, Applicants have amended Claims 2 and 3 to specify that n^o is an integer of 2.

Claim 3 has also been amended to specify that the terms W', W", W"', W"", W""', and W""" are each independently the same or different and are hydrogen, fluorine or a fluorinated phenyl. Applicants intended to refer to the terms W', W", W"', W"", W""', and W""" collectively as the single term W, but have amended Claim 3 to list each "W" term separately.

Applicants have also amended Claims 2 and 3 to correct an inadvertent typographic error. Within the definition of the aromatic moiety ("P"), the term $-C_6H_{4-n}F_n–CF_2-C_6H_{4-n}F_n–$ should have specified that n could range from 0 to 4. This is the number of fluorine substituents that may be present on each individual aromatic ring of the aromatic moiety. Claims 2 and 3 incorrectly listed the range as 0 to 8, which is the number of fluorine substituents that may be present on the aromatic moiety $-C_6H_{4-n}F_n–CF_2-C_6H_{4-n}F_n–$ as a whole.

The specification has also been amended to reflect the above clarifications.

II. Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §102(b)/§103(a)

Claims 1 and 4 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over U.S. Patent No. 5,883,144 to Bambara et al. ("Bambara").

Applicants have cancelled Claim 1. Thus, this rejection is moot. Applicants have also amended Claims 3, 4, and 5 so that they are dependent on Claim 2. Independent Claim 2 recites a structure for the ethylenic-containing precursor which is not disclosed nor suggested by Bambara. Thus, by virtue of its dependency on Claim 2, Claim 4 is not anticipated by or obvious in light of Bambara.

Applicants respectfully request that these rejections be withdrawn.

III. Double Patenting Rejections

Claims 1 – 7 stand provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double-patenting as being unpatentable over Claims 8, 9, and 11 – 14 of copending U.S. Patent Application Serial No. 10/029,373.

Applicants respectfully assert that the current application and copending U.S. Patent Application Serial No. 10/029,373 were filed on the same day: December 20, 2001. Thus, by necessity, any patents issuing from these two applications will expire on the same day. For this reason, there is no possibility of an "unjustified or improper timewise extension of the 'right to exclude' granted by a patent."

Applicants respectfully request that the double patenting rejection be withdrawn.

IX. Conclusion

Applicants respectfully submit that, in light of the foregoing comments, Claims 2 – 7 are in condition for allowance. A Notice of Allowance is therefore requested.

If the Examiner has any other matters which pertain to this Application, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned to resolve these matters by Examiner's Amendment where possible.

Respectfully submitted,

T. Ling Chwang
Registration No. 33,590
JACKSON WALKER L.L.P.
2435 North Central Expressway, #600
Richardson, TX 75080
Tel: (972) 744-2919
Fax: (972) 744-2909

December 2, 2003
Date